

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 3, 2008. Claims 3, 4, and 5 are cancelled herein. Claims 1 and 2, as amended herein, are currently in the application, with Claim 1 being the sole independent claim. Support for the amendment to Claim 1 is found at least in the subject matter of original Claim 5, and in the discussion of Figure 3 at page 10 of the specification. No new matter is entered by way of this amendment. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC § 103 in view of Japanese Publication No. 2002-332825 (Yajima). Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 over Yajima in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,041,594 (Brenner). The claims are seen to be patentable over Yajima and Brenner for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 1 includes the limitations of a pressure-reducing device switchable to either let compressed air from an air reservoir tank directly pass . . . or to reduce the pressure of the compressed air from the air reservoir tank to a predetermined pressure as it passes through said pressure-reducing device. At least these limitations are not disclosed in either of Yajima or Brenner.

When Yajima's air injection is carried out through airflow control valve 32, the air flow is determined according to the calculated flow of the reducing agent, so that the mixing ratio of the reducing agent and the air is substantially regulated according to the state of engine operation. *See* paragraph [0021]. That is, when air injection occurs, the Yajima device does not allow an unregulated flow of air from air reservoir 22, but uses compressed air that is reduced to a predetermined pressure by air flow control valve 32 to match the flow of the reducing agent. Yajima is therefore seen as failing to teach or suggest a pressure reducing device switchable to either let compressed air from an air reservoir tank directly pass . . . or to reduce the pressure of the compressed air from the air reservoir tank to a predetermined pressure as it passes through said pressure-reducing device.

Brenner is not seen to cure Yajima's deficiencies. Brenner, whether taken alone or in combination with Yajima, is seen to be deficient for failing to teach or suggest at least a pressure reducing device switchable to either let compressed air from an air reservoir tank directly pass . . . or to reduce the pressure of the compressed air from the air reservoir tank to a predetermined pressure as it passes through said pressure-reducing device.

Claim 1 is therefore seen to be allowable in view of the applied references, as is dependent Claim 2 (at least by virtue of its dependency upon Claim 1). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502203 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Irvine, California offices at 949.851.0633. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address associated with the customer number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Andrew D. Mickelsen
Registration No. 50,957

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500
Irvine, CA 92612-7108
Phone: 949.851.0633 ADM:gmb
Facsimile: 949.851.9348
Date: September 3, 2008

**Please recognize our Customer No. 31824
as our correspondence address.**